



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,365	01/31/2002	Baljeet Singh Baweja	AUS920010968US1	2933
23550	7590	04/22/2004	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC			PHAN, THANH S	
3 E-COMM SQUARE			ART UNIT	
ALBANY, NY 12207			PAPER NUMBER	
			2841	
DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,365

Applicant(s)

BAWEJA ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh S Phan

Art Unit

2841

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/31/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-19 in Paper No. 1/26/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no burden is placed on Examiner to search both claimed inventions. This is not found persuasive because burden is shown by differing classifications, a significant burden is placed on the examiner to search both claimed invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8, 9, 13, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant needs to clarify what is intended by the "disengaging" alarm clock limitation. It is unclear as to whether the alarm clock is "turned off", or the disengagement is to prevent/"turn off" the system designating alarm signals from producing the alarming signals.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2841

Claims 1- 5, 7, 11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arai [US 5,966,346].

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7, Arai discloses an alarm clock comprising a system for designating distinct and different alarm signals [column 6, lines 17-20]; and a snooze mechanism [rotary bezel 3] for deactivating a first designated alarm signal and automatically activating a second designated alarm signal after a predetermined time [abstract].

Regarding claims 3, 12, Arai further disclose the first alarm signal has a different volume level than the second alarm signal [column 2, lines 50-56].

Regarding claims 15-18, the methods steps are inherent to the apparatus structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of Guyett et al. [US 6,147,935].

Arai discloses the claimed invention except for the first and second signal use different harmonics.

Guyett et al. teaches of an alarm clock system having a plurality of pleasant sounds [column 8, lines 15-26].

Art Unit: 2841

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Guyett et al. with Arai for the purpose of providing pleasant awakening of the sleeper.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of Guyett et al. [US 6,310,833].

Regarding claim 10, Arai discloses the claimed invention except for a limit maximum snooze quantity.

Guyett et al. teach that it is known in an alarm clock system to have a limit maximum snooze quantity as set forth at column 7, lines 61-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Guyett et al. with Arai so that the user may avoid falling back into a deep sleep.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rodgers [US 5,339,294]; Thorgersen et al. [US 5,524,101]; Oprea [US 5,323,456]; Bromley et al. [US 5,819,263].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh S Phan whose telephone number is 571-272-2109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2841

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David S Martin can be reached on 571-272-2107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tsp



DAVID MARTIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800